DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 616 SP 005 954

TITLE	Program To Train Instructors of Ten Junior Colleges in the Ozark Economic Development Region.
INSTITUTION	Connors State Coll., Warner, Okla.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[72]
NOTE	14p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavior Change; *Effective Teaching; *Instructional Programs; Instructional Staff; *Junior Colleges; Program Descriptions; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This report describes a program designed to train instructors in 10 junior colleges in Oklahoma and Nebraska. Training emphasized the development of knowledge, attitudes and methods, and skills directed toward attitude and associated behavioral change of the participants. The focus emphasized program objectives and educational needs. The section on program operation presents details concerning participants, staff, activities, and evaluation. The conclusion indicates significant aspects and outcomes including the development of the learning units by the participants with associated methodological and evaluation skills, knowledge gained by the participants, and the willingness of participating institutions to allow their individual program participants to implement and test out new ideas, methods and strategies gained through participation in this training program. Appendixes include summaries of opinionnaires, participant evaluation forms and a map indicating the location of the 10 participating junior colleges. (MJM)

BHE

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: JC RC
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED 069616

CONNORS STATE COLLEGE

WARNER, OKLAHOMA 74469

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Program to Train Instructors of Ten Junior Colleges in the Ozark Economic Development Region

Grant No. 68

N I H No. 77-1938

Project No. 70-2732.1

SP 005 954

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Dr. James Klemm, Director
Academic Dean
Connors State College
Warner, Oklahoma 74469
Phone 918-463-2931 Ext. 27

Charles A. Powell, Assistant Director
Connors State College
Warner, Oklahoma 74469

Department of Graduate Studies
in Education The University of Tulsa
Dr. Stuart R. Westerlund
Professor of Education and Director
of Graduate studies in Education
Coordinator of instructional
program for the Institute

Departments of Psychology
and Sociology - University of Tulsa
were involved in
the planning and operation of the program

Training Program
March 1, 1971 to February 29, 1972

EVALUATION REPORT ON THE GRANT TO TRAIN INSTRUCTORS IN THE OZARK ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REGION

Funded by tne Department of Healtn, Education,
and Welfare Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202

Plan of Operation, Budget Explanations,
and Payment Schedule
(Title V - E.P.L. 90 - 35)
in co-operation with
Connors State College, Warner, Oklahoma

II PROGRAM FOCUS

The current program was designed around three major objectives:

1. To upgrade the instructional skills of "new" junior college instructors,
2. to better prepare these instructors to teach a disadvantaged population,
3. to provide these instructors with a base in program development and evaluation and in the specification of educational objectives.

Within the framework of the major objectives listed above, the participating junior college instructors engaged in a variety of experiences and activities tailored to the particular environment in which they serve as instructors and aimed at meeting the following educational needs:

1. Equipping participants with a knowledge and understanding of, and sensitivity to, the more salient characteristics of the disadvantaged college student,
2. equipping participants with the skills necessary to adequately plan and evaluate alternative educational programs (roles) for two year developing colleges where primary clientele are disadvantaged students,
3. equipping participants with an understanding of the theory and techniques of program development and evaluation to the specification of educational objectives and the associated evaluation of student behavioral change,

4. the development of a learning unit by each participant,

5. equipping participants with the necessary skills to field test and evaluate their respective learning units in their own classroom and make modifications as necessary based upon the evaluation.

With reference to the foregoing, the training emphasized the development of knowledges, attitudes and methods, and skills. Relative to their significance in relationship to program objectives, the three areas were closely associated but could possibly be ranked as follows:

1. Attitudes and methods
2. Development of knowledges
3. Skills

III PROGRAM OPERATION

A. Participants. Participants met all expectations of interest and maintained a fairly high level of enthusiasm throughout the program. They were eager to advance their knowledge and skills relative to dealing with disadvantaged students. They were responsive in sessions dealing with "learning by design" rather than by chance. The interaction between the participants themselves and between participants and the instructional staff was excellent, and participants were eager to discuss "new or novel" methodological strategies and techniques for improving classroom instruction. Accordingly, they responded with an eagerness to change their own attitudes and behaviors in an effort to become more effective instructors.

The participants of the institute were selected from ten junior colleges located in the "Ozark Economic Development Region" in Oklahoma

and Kansas. The twenty-six participants met all the required qualifications as outlined in the proposal.

Table I below depicts the distribution:

TABLE I

Number of New Instructors
Selected for Institute

Institution	Number Selected
Bacone College	4
Connors State College	6
Crowder College	2
Eastern Oklahoma State	2
Hutchinson Community Jr. College	1
Murray State College	2
Northeastern A&M	1
Oklahoma Military Academy	4
Poteau Community College	2
Seminole Junior College	2
Total	26

B. Staff. The instructional staff from the University of Tulsa provided both "full-time" and "part-time" instructors. Three individuals from the University operated on a "full-time" basis and were supported by two individuals who provided only limited "part-time" inputs. The full-time staff were very effective with regard to meeting the objectives of the overall program. The full-time staff helped to maintain

continuity of the program in terms of focus, target elements, process feedback, and participant outputs. Pre-planning relative to part-time staff inputs resulted in a positive contribution in support of specific program elements. They were thus able to maximize their effectiveness in relating to target objectives.

The full-time staff represented three fields: education, psychology, and sociology. Each instructor was responsible for a particular program element, but all three planned cooperatively to ensure meaningful articulation of the various components to the end that the development of the individual learning units would reflect inputs from the three areas covered in the institute. This approach contributed a great deal to the overall success of the program.

Several consultants were utilized to support the full-time instructional staff on a team basis. This approach was very effective and helped to maintain continuity in the program. In this arrangement, consultants were able to make significant instructional and resourceful inputs without detracting from the major thrust of the program.

C. Activities. The major focus of the program was directed to attitude and associated behavioral change on the part of each participant, aimed at increased effectiveness in the instructional programs of participating two-year colleges. An associated major focus included the development of "learning units" and associated methodological strategies for implementation and evaluation.

Follow-up site visits were conducted by the instructional staff for the purpose of monitoring participant field activity (implementation of learning units). Based upon these limited observations, numerous

changes were evident relative to course content, teaching methodology, sensitivity to needs of students with low achievement backgrounds,etc.

A follow-up short-term (1-week) session was just concluded (conducted for the purpose of expanding, modifying and refining the learning units). Included in this follow-up institute was a dynamic session on communication, which included participant response sheets and continuous group interaction.

[Final review of the learning units will be conducted by the instructional team during March]. At this point, however, based upon in-session observations, individual participant-instructor conferences, on-site visitations by the University of Tulsa instructional team, a conference with key administrators from participating two-year colleges, and opinionnaire responses, the overall program is judged to be a success.

Relative to the six-week summer institute, the formal instructional sessions were generally dynamic, well conducted, and usually directly related to program targets. The quality of instruction was generally high, participant-instructor rapport very good, and group interaction spontaneous and productive.

Overhead and slide projectors were used quite effectively, though sparingly. With respect to the formal instructional sessions, the usual structure involved the total group. However, the sessions devoted primarily to the construction of learning units involved both large group instruction and small group work-sessions with instructors acting as resource persons. Based upon the previous institute experience (1970-71), small work-group sessions were conducted throughout the institute rather than just the latter part of the program. This provided an opportunity for the participants to engage in development activities for the entire six-weeks utilizing the theory just presented.

This also provided immediate feedback to the instructional staff and thus allowed for continuous "process" evaluation.

Relevant materials were produced and made available to students. Some of the materials were used as resource materials for the participants and other materials were utilized in the formal instructional sessions. (Beginning and ending dates for the program are reasonable.) Resource materials from the University of Tulsa library were placed in the Connors State College library on a loan basis, and thus were made available to participants. This arrangement worked very well and provided excellent support for the program.

Participant feedback from the initial institute (1970-71) was utilized in decisions concerning the current program. In addition, a conference held with key administrators from the participating colleges contributed to such decisions.

D. Evaluation. The primary evaluation of the program is based upon an analysis of the learning units by the University of Tulsa instructional staff, and the positive changes occurring at the participating institutions. Inasmuch as the current project is still on-going, and whereas the learning units - which are supposed to reflect knowledge, methods, attitudes, and skills gained and/or changed as a result of this institute - are not due to be reviewed for final evaluation until March-April, this evaluation can only be partial. However, based upon the results of the initial project (1970-71) and results of the current project to this point, it is the concensus of those involved in the project that the overall program has been successful. Not only are the participants engaging in a variety of new instructional approaches utilizing increased awareness of individual differences of students

and the "learning by design rather than chance" phenomena, but their enthusiasm has "rubbed off" upon other colleagues (and administrators) in their respective institutions. The net outcome can only be determined over time, however; current activities would suggest that this program is having a significant impact upon and within the participating institutions.

Summaries of opinionnaires are included in the appendix section of this report. Participant (OE) evaluation forms are also included in the appendix section.

IV CONCLUSIONS

Considering the project as a whole, the most significant aspects and outcomes include the development of the learning units by the participants with associated methodological and evaluation skills, knowledge gained by the participants concerning the sociology of poverty and the utilization of this knowledge in dealing more effectively with a disadvantaged population both in and out of the classroom, and the willingness of participating institutions to allow their individual program participants to implement and test out ideas, methods, new and novel strategies, etc. gained through participation in this training program.

On-site visitations by the University of Tulsa instructional team and conferences with key administrators of the respective participating institutions indicate that "things are happening" at these institutions as a direct result of this training program. Those include instructional practices, grading practices, classroom organization and management, counseling procedures, curriculum planning and development, and faculty attitude changes.

CONNORS STATE COLLEGE
EVALUATION QUESTIONAIRE
FOR
PARTICIPANTS

Please cirlce the appropriate response.

The objectives of this program were:				
6 Very Clear & Well Explained	5 Quite Clear	6 Adequately Clear	4 Cloudy	3 Not Evident
The theoretical material presented was:				
8 Very Rewarding	4 Somewhat Rewarding	11 Worthwhile	1 Not Worthwhile	0 A Total Waste
The content of the program:				
8 Flowed Well From Issue to Issue	2 Had Evident Transitions	4 Had Adequate Continuity	6 Had Questionable Continuity	4 Was A Hodgepodge
The relationship between theory and practical application was:				
5 Very Clear & Well Drawn	6 Quite Clear	6 Adequately Clear	7 Fuzzy	0 Not Apparent
The jargon and case examples used were:				
8 Very Helpful And Useful	6 Of Value	8 About Average	2 Not Very Good	0 Detrimental
The materials used in the course:				
8 Supported The Content Well	11 Were In Tune With Content	5 Didn't Help Or Hurt Content	0 Hurt The Content	0 Negated Content Value
As a base for review, the materials will be:				
9 Very Clear & Helpful	7 Helpful	4 Satisfactory	2 Difficult To Work With	2 Of No Value
The impact of the materials on the learning process was:				
5 Very Strong	5 Strong	8 Evident	5 Questionable	1 Negative
Study materials were:				
9 Plentiful And Easily Available	1 More Than Adequate	10 Adequately Available	4 Hard To Come By	0 Totally Unsatisfactory
The physical facilities used for the program were:				
9 Exceptionally Good	8 Quite Good	7 Adequate	0 Less Than Adequate	0 Terrible

PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION FORM, CONT'.

The instructors presentational skills were:				
6 Exceptionally Good	4 Very Good	10 Quite Acceptable	2 Not Very Good	2 Inadequate
As a person the instructor inspired you to:				
15 Question And Examine Your Attitudes & Methods	5 Look Into Your Methods	3 Be Aware Of Your Methods	1 Remain Largely Unchanged	0 Reject The Concept Of Change
The intellect of the other participants:				
18 Added Greatly To The Program	6 Was Of Value To The Program	0 Didn't Help Or Hurt Much	0 Hurt The Program	0 Negated The Programs Value
The background of the other participants was:				
19 Very Helpful & Enlightening	5 Added To The Program	0 Didn't Help Or Hurt Much	0 Was Of Little Value	0 Was Of No Value
The spirit of the participants was to:				
20 Share With Each Other And Grow Together	4 Share To Some Extent	0 Interact When Necessary	0 Withdraw From Interaction	0 Keep What They Knew A Secret
153	78	82	34	12
231		82	46	

APPENDIX A

Figure I Ozark Economic Development Region

and

Location of the Ten Participating Junior Colleges

1. Bacone College
2. Connors State College
3. Crowder College
4. Eastern Oklahoma State
5. Hutchinson Community Jr. College
6. Murray State College
7. Northeastern A&M
8. Oklahoma Military Academy
9. Poteau Community College
10. Seminole Junior College